

170

---

---

**Supreme Court of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1945

---

No. 622

---

MATTIE BRADEY, as Administratrix of the Estate of  
Marion Thomas Bradey, deceased,  
*against* Petitioner,

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, as represented by War  
Shipping Administration,  
Respondent.

---

---

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SECOND  
PETITION FOR REHEARING**

---

---

SIMONE N. GAZAN,  
Attorney for Movant,  
One Broadway,  
New York City.

---

---

# Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1945

---

No. 622

---

---

MATTIE BRADEY, as Administratrix of the Estate of  
Marion Thomas Bradey, deceased,  
Petitioner,

*against*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, as represented by War  
Shipping Administration,  
Respondent.

---

## MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SECOND PETITION FOR REHEARING

TO THE HONORABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND THE ASSOCIATE  
JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED  
STATES:

Mattie Bradey, as Administratrix of the Estate of  
Marion Thomas Bradey, deceased, respectfully prays an  
order of this court allowing her to file a Second Petition  
for Rehearing based upon her Petition for Certiorari  
which was denied on January 28th, 1946.

Your movant respectfully shows that since the denial  
of her Petition for Certiorari, which sought to review  
a decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals  
for the Second Circuit, that the United States Circuit  
Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has decided the

same legal question contrary to the decision of the said Second Circuit, thereby creating a conflict between Circuit Courts of Appeal which should be reconciled and the law settled by decision of this court.

WHEREFORE movant prays an order allowing her to file a second petition for rehearing.

Dated: New York, N. Y., May 29th, 1946.

Respectfully submitted,

SIMONE N. GAZAN,  
Attorney for Movant.

---

**Certificate.**

I hereby certify that I have examined the foregoing Motion for Leave to File Second Petition for Re-hearing and in my opinion it is well founded and entitled to the favorable consideration of the Court, and that it is not filed for the purpose of delay.

SIMONE N. GAZAN.